Date: Thu, 30 Dec 93 04:30:09 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #556
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 30 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 556

Today's Topics:

cw speed
The 10-meters band - No CW required ? (5 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 93 01:19:49 EST
From: swrinde!gatech!usenet.ufl.edu!usenet.cis.ufl.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!
wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: cw speed
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

[previous responses deleted]
> My point was that this also applies to the people who are working on
> upgrading, who are trying to improve their code speed, and who don't
> object to the current licensing structure. The people who post here
> tend to be those who complain about the current system. Occasionally,
> one of the large majority who don't object to the current system is
> goaded into responding.

Not all. I am doing both. I am getting my code speed up because that is
the way it is. I post here because I feel that is not the way it should
be.

> Incidentally, if the code is the thing that is holding everyone back,

> why are there so many General class hams, when they could easily take
> the Advanced level exams and upgrade without having to take a code
> test?   They can't all be people who made it to General only recently
> and are in transit to Advanced, since in many cases their licenses go
> back several years.
>

Or maybe just that those that made it to General are happy with the
class they are at. OR! maybe they are just good at emulating a modem.

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu
---
Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear.
Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub
together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore
these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to
use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into
machinery that does not work too well at best.   -L. Long

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 93 02:00:39 EST
From: sdd.hp.com!nigel.msen.com!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

collinst@esvx19.es.dupont.com (Thomas Collins WI3P) writes:

> In article <CIrIG8.8Cs@news.iastate.edu>, wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Tur
> >In article <1993Dec28.184600.4067@es.dupont.com> collinst@esvx19.es.dupont.c
> >
>
> >> Also, for a obsolete mode, why do all the Armed Forces
> >> still teach CW world-wide? Bottom line is when other
> >> modes of communications fail for various reasons, CW
> >> can get the message there.......
> >
> >Are they? My experience with the Air Force the last few years is they don't
> >I'd be interested in some proof one way or the other...
> >
> >
>
> My meager contacts with the Security Agency types in
> two of the services (Navy and Army) still are training
> operators in CW and 18 WPM is still the passing speed.
> However now, with the use of computers for the past

> decade the failure rate has dropped to less than .3%
> as the computer can find problem areas a drill on these.
> It will also give warnings when 'goofing' off at the
> keyboard it noted.

God, what I would give for THAT program...

:-)

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

---

Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear. Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into machinery that does not work too well at best. -L. Long

---

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 93 01:32:27 EST
From: usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!gatech!usenet.ufl.edu!usenet.cis.ufl.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

> Robert, a little learning might do you some good. The FCC has *not*
> set aside portions of each band for CW usage. In fact, the *only*
> frequencies that are set aside exclusively for CW operation are
> 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1, and guess what, *you don't have to pass
> a Morse test to use them*. All the other non-voice/image segments are
> digital mode subbands. CW is, of course, allowed on *any* amateur
> frequency, though it's hardly used on any frequency where better
> modes, such as SSB or FM, are allowed.
>
> And I still maintain that your claim that memorizing a question pool
> demonstrates little can equally be said about memorizing 26 alphabetic
> encodings. I challenge *you* to show how this is "advancing the state
> of the radio art" since CW usage is now obsolete in every major radio
> service except for some amateurs', and a few cheap shipowners', radio
> rooms.

It takes effort to learn theroy, it takes effort to memorize a 300+ question pool, it takes effort to memorize less than 50 characters (that go beep in the night). All in all, the latter seems the LEAST effort.

(Add in what Gary said above, he beat me to it.)

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu
---
Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear.
Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub
together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore
these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to
use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into
machinery that does not work too well at best.   -L. Long

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 93 01:47:52 EST
From: sdd.hp.com!nigel.msen.com!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

collinst@esvx19.es.dupont.com (Thomas Collins WI3P) writes:

> In article <CIr8uB.2xC@news.iastate.edu>, wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Tur
> >I'm sorry, but I saw a comment I *had* to respond to. It was an arguement
> >very similar, if not identical, to one used in a few other organizations I'm
> >in, and I want to point out how *stupid* it sounds. Do not take what I say
> >to express my position on the code/no-code debate, as it doesn't hold at all
> >
> >(For the record, I feel CW testing is obsolete, but CW is still a terrific
> >mode of operation. In fact, it is what I use most. However, complaining he
> >won't help anything get done...)
> >
> I keep seeing many say that CW is obsolete and that the
> Marine service have given it up (except for the cheap
> ones). Am I the only one who listens to 'other than'
> the Ham bands? I hear plenty of CW from 3.0 to 26.0 Mhz.
> And doesn't 'obsolete' mean no longer used? CW may be
> slower than some modes, but it is far from being
> obsolete.
>
> Also, for a obsolete mode, why do all the Armed Forces
> still teach CW world-wide? Bottom line is when other
> modes of communications fail for various reasons, CW
> can get the message there.......

But computers (with approiate additions) can recieve CW well below the
level a human (modem) can. And with error checking that a human can't.

>
> And no, its not a test of character or ones proficency
> with electronics....but it is far from obsolete.... and
> it does show ones dedication in advancing up the licensing
> scale. (Yes, I value my Extra class license and the meager
> portions of Extra only bands, and damn proud of it.)

No one said you should not be. Just that as things become less important
(or even useless) they should be replaced with better, more efficient
and usefull ways. (i.e. spark, AM, ect..)
>
> >learning, but it also doesn't serve any *useful* purpose in amateur radio,
> >just as physical p[unishment and psychological stress serves no useful purpo
> >in Arnold Air Society. Just as our pledge program has changed to test the
> >pledges in other ways, generally with more stress on the national pledge tes
> >they must pass to become members, amateur radio *must* change also. At some
> >point in the future, code testing will probably be replaced with something
> >else. I don't know what, but it may just be more written questions on theor
> >and regulations. Whatever happens, calling it learning won't save CW. It
> >just won't work.
> >
> >--
> >Will Turner, N0RDV   ---
> >wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
> >twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
> >TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov   ---
>
> Now we have reached a new low in the Code vs. No-Code,
> here linking learning Morse Code with physical punishment
> and psychological stress.....Hell, maybe you can convince
> the FCC to give everyone who complains a 'Code Waiver'....
>
>   8-)

That IS the point. Requiring CW tests to gain access to SSB and other
NON-CW spectrum is phychological hazing, pure and simple. No other
rational explination obtains.

 Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

---
Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear.
Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub
together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore
these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to
use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into
machinery that does not work too well at best.   -L. Long

Date: Wed, 29 Dec 93 20:02:03 EST
From: swrinde!gatech!usenet.ufl.edu!usenet.cis.ufl.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!
wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

> In article <1993Dec25.145937.1535@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
> Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:
> >Ah, but *you* on the other hand want the license handed to you for
> >memorizing 26 simple mechanical sounds, plus some numbers and
> >punctuation. You insist that memorizing over 400 theory questions
> >is easy, yet insist on a test of simple sonic recall. Who's lazy?
>
> If learning the code is so easy, why are people bitching so mightily?

Because to some, it is a useless skill. And no other part of the tests
require PASS/FAIL like morse testing.

> The answer is simple: the folks in this group are disproportionately
> college-educated, and so think that they should be able to get a ham ticket
> using the same techniques they use to get through school. They can regurgitat
> answers to test questions with great ease while retaining little practical,
> useful knowledge.

My tests are never that easy, just ask my students, and I prefer multiple
choice formats (mostly).

> The code is not amenable to such treatment. It's not even close to a "test of
> simple sonic recall"; it only yields to effort and work.

In plain english it is called HAZING.

> Those who argue that
> the code should be done away with are merely trying to remove the necessity
> for real work for themselves; their response, "Just make the written tests
> harder!", would not affect them - but it _would_ destroy the hobby for those
> they do not represent, by making it next to impossible for folks who _aren't_
> college-trained engineers to pass the tests.
>
> The current licensing structure is admirably balanced: some folks have
> difficulty with the code, and some have difficulty with the theory. In either
> case, the candidate must work to achieve, and thus values the achievement
> more. Doing away with that would hand licenses to some folks on a silver

> platter, and deny them entirely to others.

If they were equally balanced with all parts being equal, I for one would not voice opposition. But the fact remains they are NOT balanced. Code is tested by itself, pass/fail, that's it. ALL other aspects are graded over all. Combine the morse test TOGETHER with the other questions and THEN it will be truly balanced.

> I am not surprised that those who would have the licenses handed to them
> advocate such a change. Neither am I surprised that this forum would be
> overrun with folks in that category. I hope sincerely that the FCC is not
> blinded by the rhetoric of laziness.

Where is it decreed that an amateur radio license must be EARNED? You must pass tests to ensure that you will operate your station properly. Given the fact that we are allowed to adjust our transmitters we need to demonstrate a level of competence. But over and above that, what is there about amateur radio that requires one to EARN a license? Amateur license are to LEARN, maybe that is were the confusion came in.

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

---

Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear. Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into machinery that does not work too well at best. -L. Long

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

---

Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear. Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into machinery that does not work too well at best. -L. Long

---

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 93 06:18:48 EST
From: swrinde!gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

> In article <1993Dec28.184600.4067@es.dupont.com> collinst@esvx19.es.dupont.co
> > Also, for a obsolete mode, why do all the Armed Forces
> > still teach CW world-wide? Bottom line is when other
> > modes of communications fail for various reasons, CW
> > can get the message there.......
>
> Actually, the US military no longer teaches it's radiomen Morse.
> Only intercept specialists are now taught Morse. It's considered
> too slow for tactical use, and too easy to DF and draw artillery
> fire on the battlefield.

Interesting concept Gary. Were you suggesting a particular TARGET?

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

---

Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear.
Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub
together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore
these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to
use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into
machinery that does not work too well at best.   -L. Long

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #556
****
****